

of California and socialist independent Bernard Sanders of Vermont.

[From the News India-Times, Nov. 10, 1995]

#### BIGGEST THREAT TO LOBBYING EFFORTS

WASHINGTON.—“Sikh nation” activists led by Gurmit Singh Aulakh perhaps pose the biggest challenge and threat to India’s lobbying efforts in the capital, only next to the anti-India campaign funded by pro-Pakistan forces.

Aulakh got some print mileage last week in the conservative daily paper, Washington Times, which promptly published his offensive “encounter” with his bete noir, none other than the Indian ambassador to the US, Siddhartha Shankar Ray. The juicy part of the report is that Aulakh called Ray “a murderer.”

According to the paper, Aulakh, “a leader of Sikh expatriates”, spotted Ray in the Longworth House Office Building one day last month. “I walked up to him and told him, you are a murderer and you should not be walking these halls,” Aulakh told the paper describing his brief confrontation.

Aulakh, president of the Council of Khalistan, blames Ray for “widespread human rights abuses” when the ambassador was governor of Punjab in the late 1980s. “During that time thousands died in violence linked to Sikh demands for a separate land,” the paper said in its “embassy row” column, adding that “Ray could not be reached for comment.”

News India-Times learned that Ray, who was caught unawares by the intruder, had reportedly shot back, “Who are you?” Later an escort took Aulakh aside and asked him not to spoil the Hill meeting scheduled by Ray.

The Washington Times further said that Aulakh was organizing a rally in front of the White House at Lafayette Park on Nov. 4, culminating in a march to the Indian Embassy on the anniversary of a 1984 confrontation in Delhi in which thousands of Sikhs were killed.

Aulakh has also been publicizing a letter signed by 65 members of US Congress, calling on Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao to release “Sikh human rights activist” Jaswant Singh Khalra. The letter cites an Amnesty International bulletin of September 7, accusing Indian police of abducting Khalra.

Khalra “had published a report showing that the Punjab police have arrested more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, then declared them unidentified and cremated their bodies,” the letter said.

“These atrocities are intolerable in any country, especially one that calls itself a democracy. . . . This abuse of police power is inexcusable.”

The letter, organized by Rep. Gary Condit, California Democrat, drew wide bipartisan congressional support, from lawmakers including conservative Republican Dan Burton of Indiana, liberal Democrat Ronald Dellums of California and socialist independent Bernard Sanders of Vermont.

The anti-India signature drive by the Council of Khalistan in terms of the number of lawmakers on the Hill it had mobilized, was simply too big to be overwhelmed by a pro-India signature drive such as the one mobilized by the India Caucus against the Brown amendment as only 40 house members had signed the caucus letter.

#### THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAY OF INFAMY

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 1995*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no American of my generation who does not recall where they were and what they were doing 54 years ago today.

On that day—which President Franklin D. Roosevelt labelled “a day which will live in infamy”—aircraft of the Japanese Empire staged a surprise attack on the army and naval forces stationed at Pearl Harbor, HI.

Striking without warning at 7:55 a.m. local time, the Japanese forces succeeded in sinking or severely damaging 19 of our naval vessels, including three battleships—the *West Virginia*, the *California*, and the *Arizona*. A fourth battleship—the *Oklahoma*—was capsized and a fifth—the *Nevada*—sustained heavy damage during a second strike by Japanese forces about an hour after the first. This second strike also succeeded in reducing three additional destroyers to wrecks.

Ninety-seven army airplanes and eighty naval aircraft were also destroyed by the Japanese in the attack, most of which while still on the ground at nearby Hickam and Wheeler fields.

The unexpected, immoral attack by Japan, which took place at the exact minute that peace negotiations were taking place in Washington, claimed the lives of over 2,000 men and women in the U.S. Navy, over 200 Army personnel, and 49 civilians.

As was the case with the bombardment of Fort Sumter for an earlier generation, and the assassination of President John F. Kennedy at a later time, the attack on Pearl Harbor radically altered the lives of millions of Americans and also changed the direction which our Nation had been following.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, the general attitude of millions of Americans was that the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans formed a great natural defense against any and all enemies. Accordingly, it was not only unnecessary but also undesirable for the United States to involve itself in international affairs under any circumstances. Such highly respected Americans as the aviator and national hero Charles A. Lindbergh, former U.S. President Herbert Hoover, and newspaper publisher Robert R. McCormick had for months publicly denounced any American involvement in World War II and received a great deal of support and acclaim from the American people for doing so. When the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor, all support for this point of view virtually evaporated overnight. All Americans put their prior political beliefs aside and joined in a united front to win the war in a manner of national unity never experienced by the American people before or since.

Although there has been great national debate on many important issues throughout the 54 years since the Day of Infamy, including the current ongoing debate regarding our involvement in Bosnia, never since Pearl Harbor has any American seriously suggested that our Nation completely withdraw from the international stage and depend upon the vastness of the oceans for our security. Although there have been many debates regarding our defense posture, never since Pearl Harbor has

anyone suggested that our military be dismantled.

The more than 2,400 military and naval personnel who gave their lives the morning of December 7, 1941, were joined by thousands more who made the supreme sacrifice in the European and Pacific theaters of World War II. Thousands of more courageous veterans risked and gave their lives in Korea, in Southeast Asia, and in the Persian Gulf. Thousands more are now being put into harm’s way in Bosnia. The courage and valor of our veterans has never been questioned throughout the 54 years since the Day of Infamy.

Some observers at the time, in numbers which have increased in frequency and in shrillness since Pearl Harbor, have contended that President Roosevelt was duplicitous in his foreign policy, and in fact knew that the attack on Pearl Harbor was coming. These partisan revisionists contend that the President wanted the disaster to take place at Pearl Harbor to unite the American people into fighting World War II.

These slanderous contentions against President Roosevelt are not only totally lacking in any supporting evidence, they also fly in the face of the massive historic evidence which is at our disposal. In all of his public statements at the time, in his private conferences with Winston Churchill and others which were made public after his death, and in private correspondence which is only now coming to light, President Roosevelt made it clear that his top priority was defeating Hitler and the Nazi hordes which had overrun Europe and North Africa. The last thing in the world President Roosevelt wanted was a war in the Pacific which would divert American attention and energies from defeating Nazi Germany.

In fact, in the days following Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt fretted over how he could unite the American people against Hitler when all of our rage and energies were concentrated against the Japanese. Hitler himself solved this problem for Roosevelt when he declared war against the United States within a week. Recently, historians have argued that, if Hitler were smart enough to restrain from declaring war on us, it is conceivable that our anger against the Japanese would have prevented our ever entering the war in Europe.

In any case, there are none of us who can dispute that Pearl Harbor altered our Nation and each of our individual lives in ways that none of us could foresee 54 years ago.

Today, on December 7, it is the responsibility of those of us who remember that perfidious attack to remind younger generations of the valuable lessons we learned. We learned that we must never again give the perception of a weak defense posture. We learned that we cannot live isolated from the world. We also learned that, when threatened, the American people can act with unity and vigor in a manner unheard of in all previous history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join in reflecting on the meaning of this most significant of all days in our history.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 1995*

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was not present for rollcall vote